

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Objections

The Office Action objected to Claims 1, 7 and 12 because the claim language lacked a structural relationship between the housing and the single wheel. Applicant has canceled Claims 1, 7 and 12. Claim 18 has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate the language of base Claim 1, and is now an allowable Claim. Claim 21 has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate the language of base Claim 7, and is now an allowable Claim. Claim 23 has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate the language of base Claim 7 and intervening Claim 11, and is now an allowable Claim. Applicant has addressed the objections in amended Claims 18, 21 and 23 by stating that the single wheel is “rotatably disposed within said housing”.

103(a) Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12-16, 19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Presley (U.S. Pat. No. 3,163,941) in view of Stoner (U.S. Pat. No. 361,791) and in view of Canalle (U.S. Pat. No. 6,571,487).

The Office Action further rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Betts (U.S. Pat. No. 5,430,952) in view of Kuze et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,965,944).

Finally, The Office Action rejected claims 4, 9 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Betts and Kuze et al. as applied to claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 17 and 20 above, and further in view of Hodges (U.S. Pat. No. 6,408,529).

Applicant submits that the above rejections are moot because allowable Claims 18, 21 and 23 have been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the

respective base Claims 1 and 7. Dependent Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 17, 19 and 24 depend from Claim 18, which are also deemed allowable. Dependent Claims 8, 9, 10, 11, 20 and 22 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 21 and are also deemed allowable.

CONCLUSION

No new matter has been added.

Applicant has rewritten all claims to depend from the objected, yet allowable Claims 18 and 21. Claim 23 is rewritten in independent form. If Examiner disagrees with Applicant's position and would like to receive further clarifying explanations of the significance of Applicant's invention, it is respectfully requested that Applicant be granted a telephonic, or in-person, interview with Examiner.

Otherwise, should the Examiner have any questions regarding this submission, he is invited to contact the undersigned counsel at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted, this 9th day of May, 2006,



Greg O'Bradovich, Esq.
Reg. No. 42,945
Email: gobradovich@mkiplaw.com

MYERS & KAPLAN,
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, L.L.C.
1899 Powers Ferry Road
Suite 310
Atlanta, GA 30339
Phone: (770) 541-7444
Fax: (770) 541-7448